The Evaluation Office (EO), in UNICEF (New York), provides global leadership and oversight for the evaluation function. EO is responsible for developing an agenda and work plan to evaluate UNICEF’s programmes and processes. We conduct and/or manage independent, corporate evaluations and evaluation syntheses, provide technical assistance and quality assurance for evaluations commissioned at the decentralized level (country and regional offices), as well as other divisions in HQ offices. EO is also responsible for publishing a global evaluation plan that accompanies respective corporate strategies.¹

This Evaluation is part of UNICEF’s global evaluation plan for 2018-2021. The tentative timeline for the execution of the evaluation is May – September 2019, while submission evaluation report to the UNICEF’s Executive Board is planned end of 2019.

II. Intervention Background- Global trend of urbanization

Extreme poverty is often concentrated in urban spaces, and national, regional and city governments struggle to accommodate the rising population in these areas. Making cities safe and sustainable means ensuring access to safe and affordable housing and upgrading slum settlements. It also involves investment in public transport, creating green public spaces, and improving urban planning and management in a way that is both participatory and inclusive. Furthermore, nearly than half of the child population in the world live in an urban area.

According to the World Urbanization Prospects by UN DESA’s Population Division, more than half of the world’s population (4 billion people) now live in urban areas. Among which more than 828 million lives in the slums. By 2050, that figure will have risen to 6.5 billion people – two-thirds of all humanity. In the ’90s there were about 10 cities reaching more than 10 million of inhabitants. In 2014, there were more than 28 cities. In the coming decades, 95% of urban expansion will take place in the developing world.

According to UN World Urbanization Prospects², the observed growth in the urban population is mainly driven by factors such as overall population increase and by the ascendant shift in the population living in urban areas. Together, these two factors are projected to add 2.5 billion to the world’s urban population by 2050, with almost 90 % of this growth happening in Asia and Africa. Just three countries – India, China and Nigeria – together are expected to account for 35 % of the growth in the world’s urban population between 2018 and 2050. By 2030, the world is projected to have 43 megacities, most of them in developing regions.

¹ For more information about the Evaluation Office, visit the following website: http://www.UNICEF.org/evaluation.
The Global Evaluation Plan is offered at here: https://www.UNICEF.org/about/execboard/files/2018-3-Global_Eval-ODS-EN.pdf
Cities, and Rapid urbanisation creates challenges for children and youth that needs to be addressed. Among those challenges as they relate to the health and nutrition sectors, the most deprived and poorest families and their children often have difficulties accessing basic health and nutrition services; more over such services when available in urban settings targeting the poorest areas, are often poor quality. For the health sector, outbreaks are more visible in high population density areas such as urban settings, and while the global vaccine coverage is improving compared to rural, it remains low in slums and informal settlements. Hunger and undernutrition wear an increasingly urban face. The number of the poor and undernourished is increasing faster in urban than in rural areas. According to the State of the World children report, every year, polluted indoor air is considered responsible for almost 2 million deaths among children under 5 years of age (SoWC, p.4).

Unsafe water, poor sanitation and unhygienic conditions claim many lives each year, including an estimated 1.2 million children under the age of 5 who die from diarrhoea in 2012 (SoWC, p.6). While often the urban residents have better access to water and sanitation, the costs and accessibility due to long queue and incapacity of water and quality sanitation services and infrastructures are unable to cope with the rapidly increasing population. This is particularly true for slums where high risk areas for communicable diseases. Although WASH access and service coverage are often higher in urban areas than rural, there are deep inequalities in intra-urban access. Intra-urban inequalities in WASH services can be so large that many of the most marginalized children in urban areas fare worse than their counterparts in rural areas³.

For the education sector, again high disparities are noticeable in schooling services and attendance rate. Most deprived families will not have access to schools, especially in slums where education options are few. In cities, and particularly in slums, there are challenges associate with having more diverse groups, and greater ethnicity as well as children working in streets.

Child protection in urban areas has also its challenges. Birth registration, especially in the poorest and slums are low and child trafficking, violence and crime are affecting children and yet system and social justice mechanisms are not sufficient or in place to protect children in this challenging context. With protracted displacement proliferating, UNICEF’s urban work must focus also on ensuring that displaced children and families have access to the services and protection that meets their needs and rights.

Several important challenges also affect children and youth, such as migration, to avoid violence, crime and the gang phenomenon, poverty and economic shocks. In addition, children in urban settings are often inhabitants who live in precarious circumstances and not prepared to face a sudden emergency. Children from the lower quintile often live in fragile homes built on the least wanted urban spaces, near natural and unnatural water ways and on low ground at risk of flood or near industrial and urban waste sites.

Other risks and challenges are associated with the environment and climate changes: Higher concentrations of people, factories, vehicles, and their wastes mean greater health risks in urban areas; climate change, environmental hazards and natural disasters. Natural hazards, such as cyclones and mudslides, swiftly become unnatural disasters in urban areas – their impact intensified by overcrowding, fragile homes.

Local governments and cities play an essential role in addressing some of the above challenges. While the assignment of responsibilities varies across and within countries, most urban governments and cities share responsibilities across water and sanitation, social welfare, health care and education. These multiple responsibilities, along with relatively more autonomy, make local governments and cities indispensable for efforts to reduce the multiple deprivations that beset the poorest and most vulnerable children in urban areas. However, municipal governments are not the only “game in town,” nor can city hall respond effectively to the drivers of multiple overlapping deprivations on its own. Full and complete responsibility for service delivery in urban areas rarely, if ever, falls under the complete authority of municipal governments. For instance, service delivery responsibilities in and around informal settlements are frequently shared among several public agencies, private firms, and non-profit providers, including community organizations. Such service delivery arrangements highlight the importance of inclusive mechanisms that support local coordination and collaboration.

¹ Advantage or Paradox? The challenge for children and young people of growing up urban:
At the same time, national and regional laws, policies and regulation, specifically around decentralization, significantly influence the ability of local government to address child deprivations in urban areas. They influence the level of financing and decision-making authority assigned to municipal governments and shape the extent to which communities can influence the overall level and composition of social services in an urban area. The quality of national decentralization policy and its subsequent implementation therefore has profound implications for how UNICEF pursues equity for children in urban areas, particularly in the context of rapid urbanization in low and middle-income countries.

A robust situation analysis of each country’s urban contexts is therefore imperative to understand how UNICEF programming must be adapted to meet the needs of disadvantaged children living in urban settings. This is especially important in the case of urban humanitarian crises owing to the difficulties encountered in accessing densely populated areas hit by hazards or conflict, and the challenges of identifying and targeting vulnerable children.

### III. UNICEF’s Interventions for Urban Programming for children

The work of UNICEF on children in an urban setting and cities is not new and started many years ago⁴. UNICEF’s strategic plan 2018-21 recognizes the challenges offered by rapid urbanization, and the need to work in urban areas. Indeed, “Today, more than half of the world’s children live in cities, including many in urban slums. It is imperative that city planning is responsive to the rights of women, girls and boys.” And “In cities, UNICEF will support the expansion of essential services to the poorest urban communities; work with local authorities to make city planning child responsive and strengthen the evidence base on equity gaps among children.”⁵ UNICEF will also continue its work on supporting adolescent and community participation in local decision-making, strengthening social accountability mechanisms, enhancing urban and local government capacity to develop child responsive plans and to deliver public services for children in an equitable manner.

UNICEF has adopted related indicators:

4.8. The proportion of cities with a direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management that operate regularly and democratically (Goal 11.3.2) (other key UN partners who are contributing to this indicator are; UNDP, United Nations Human Settlement Programme (UN-Habitat)). In addition, it also refers to two output indicators: 4. d.1. Number of countries with data on intra-urban disparities, including girls and boys in informal settings and 4. d.2. Number of countries where urban/local government development plans and budgets and urban planning standards are child-responsive and involve participation of children.

Also, the Strategic Plan includes humanitarian action as one of the cross-cutting priorities and stipulates that UNICEF will focus on the delivery of faster, more effective and at-scale humanitarian response in line with the UNICEF Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action, including adaptions for an effective response to health emergencies and mass population displacements and protracted crises, which often occur in urban settings.

UNICEF⁶ work on children in cities are covered in several program areas and goals of the strategic plan 2018-21 and several divisions within UNICEF are contributing to these results and/or outcomes. UNICEF’s Urban interventions fall in two key categories; 1) sectoral urban programming and 2) non-sectoral urban programming as described in the mapping of Urban programming report (2016) which built on case studies from a sample of UNICEF programme countries. These are summarized in the table below:

---

⁴ Urban Basic Services in UNICEF : [https://www.UNICEF.org/about/history/trim/urban_child/doc/doc309654.pdf](https://www.UNICEF.org/about/history/trim/urban_child/doc/doc309654.pdf) and [https://www.UNICEF.org/about/history/trim/urban_child/](https://www.UNICEF.org/about/history/trim/urban_child/)

Table 1: UNICEF’s Urban Programming interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectoral Urban Programming initiatives</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>WASH is UNICEF’s most prevalent urban intervention (after the multiple social inclusion initiatives) and accounts for more than 30% of the global annual WASH budget. Two thirds of this goes towards emergency situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and nutrition</td>
<td>Several health and nutrition efforts include; improving child and newborn health through IMCI, health system strengthening and immunization efforts, Several health efforts have focused on containing epidemics including Cholera and Ebola, especially critical in dense urban areas, In Nigeria, the Ebola outbreak, starting in densely populated Lagos, could easily have spread out of control, especially in the context of critical gaps in infrastructure and an under-equipped public health system, but was quickly contained by government working with UNICEF and other partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Although access to schooling is generally better in urban areas, there are many places where the availability of decent schooling for the poorest urban children falls behind what is available in rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>The insecurity and multiple stresses associated with the challenging environments of urban poverty have effects for social cohesion. It is generally considered that violence, abuse and exploitation are more common in urban areas, and that children are in particular need of protection efforts. In India, the Moradabad initiative focused on the rights and protection of children, many of them workers in the local metal ware industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-sectoral urban programming Initiatives</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian work</td>
<td>Several sectors provide powerful entry point in complex, fragile situations, responding to extreme immediate needs but at the same time investing in the long term by strengthening vital systems and capacities and laying the groundwork for continuing broader collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Friendly Cities Initiative (CFCI)</td>
<td>The CFCI was launched in 1996 by UNICEF and UN-Habitat to act on the resolution passed during the second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II), to ensure basic services for children and to make cities livable places for all. As defined as: “is a city, town, community or any system of local governance committed to fulfilling child rights as articulated in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CFCI Handbook, 2018)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR and climate change adaptation</td>
<td>Disaster risk, often exacerbated by climate change, is a fundamental reality in many of these countries, undermining development, contributing to poverty and in some cases underpinning conflict. There are significant urban impacts: not only do disasters, including earthquakes, and even more gradual changes in climate, sabotage development gains in every area, but urban development deficits, in turn, greatly intensify the impact of disasters and climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening evidences bases on Children in Urban areas</td>
<td>Critical to UNICEF’s urban programming is the capacity to accurately assess realities for urban children – whether on a national level to support a larger strategy, or in terms of local understanding. Yet access to reliable urban data is a knotty problem. The situation for children is not the only thing that needs to be assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>The breadth and complexity of partnerships is a critical feature of urban programming. Not only are local governments more likely to play a critical role here, but there can be issues with overlapping jurisdictions, especially in rapidly developing peri-urban zones, and the private sector and civil society are also far more prominent actors within the urban domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy (decentralization and local governance; child poverty and public finance)</td>
<td>Most notable in this stream of work has been the very significant focus on decentralization and local governance, including in urban areas. UNICEF has made major strides in recent years on this front, with a local governance specialist in HQ and a clear recognition that the structural inequities that underpin children’s deprivation cannot realistically be addressed at scale except in collaboration with this level of government. In 2018, 77 UNICEF country offices were engaging in this area, with focus on generating local data; local planning and budgeting; local participation and local service delivery arrangements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A major aspect of the urban work has been the growing capacity within COs to arrive at disaggregated analyses of urban poverty, revealing the depth of urban child deprivation in the context of the all too frequent confidence in reassuring urban averages. The Bangladesh example was mentioned in the introduction.

Communication for Development
UNICE engage with populations and communities by establishing cross-sectoral and behavioral outcome focused C4D approaches in all its programs, and facilitate interagency coordination with and participation of humanitarian actors at national and local levels in all response plans including preparedness and recovery phases.

In 2012, UNICEF published The State of the World Children’s Report- 2012 which focuses on children and the urban agenda. Following this important work, a Global Urban Strategic Note - Urban 101 was prepared in 2016 and identified potential areas of interventions. A year later a Global Strategy Note on UNICEF’s work for children in an urban setting (May 2017) was approved. The stated objective of the Global Strategy Note is to set out the key areas of UNICEF priorities for children living in urban settings, as well as the key pillars of programmatic action and strategy. The note indicates that further guidance will be provided in support of the Strategic plan implementation. Also, stated that this note should inform the preparation of CPDs and work plans at all levels of the organization. The following are five priority areas of UNICEF’s Urban work which are illustrated in the strategic note:

1. **Reducing equity gaps in urban areas through technical support and partnerships to extend quality social services to marginalized children living in urban settings and protect all children from violence.**
   Several entry points are proposed:
   a. Robust situation analysis of each country’s urban contexts;
   b. Working to bolster the capacity of local authorities to reach the most marginalized and impoverished children living in urban settings;
   c. Strengthen links between national and local programs in urban areas; and
   d. Support cities that present new areas of sector or multi-sector-based work for children, such as, but not limited to gang violence, for which urban settings offer the possibility to address at greater scale.

2. **Promoting a safe and sustainable urban environment for children.** This requires UNICEF to provide greater attention to the effect of harmful pollutants on children and support and/or take actions to reduce them. This also includes risk and disaster reduction, and harmful humanitarian events affecting children in cities.

3. **Adapting urban planning and budgeting for children living in urban settings, particularly the most disadvantaged.** This includes ensuring that urban spaces and cities are developed and planned to also address the needs of the children but also work around child responsive local governance and work with city governments to develop child-rights based policies and planning, strengthen inclusive decision-making and accountability, and ensure that urban financing is responsive to children’s needs.

4. **Enhancing the voice and participation of poor children living in urban settings and strengthening partnerships with urban communities and organizations.** An important entry point is through community-based participation, to ensure that the interests of children and adolescents are taken into account in the development of their urban settings, as key stakeholders.

5. **Strengthening the evidence base on children in urban areas, in data, policy and research.** Data generation, through the MICS, offers a lot of opportunities, with several countries piloting urban MICS. Beyond data, developing a coherent research program that will contribute to the body of knowledge related to Urban issues affecting children.

The approval of the strategy was accompanied by the creation of a post of Senior Adviser (P5), Urban in UNICEF HQ and placed in the Policy Analysis Unit of Division of Data, Research and Policy where other emerging areas of programming for UNICEF namely Climate Change and Migration are placed. An urban practice group at the technical level and a Director’s group at the management level has been established for coordination and information sharing.
In 2018 UNICEF was engaged in urban programming in a total of 72 countries across all regions. In most of these countries this was in the context of development programming, but in a total of 23 countries urban interventions were also a component of humanitarian response programmes. Similarly, in 23 countries, UNICEF is supporting urban local governments to make their development plans child responsive. Examples of urban programming cover a wide range of interventions across all SP Goal areas and include advocacy, data collection, service delivery, supply procurement, funding and a wide range of technical support.

### IV  Purpose of the Evaluation, Scope, Key questions and intended use

**Purpose:** The plan for the Evaluation is anchored in the 2018-21 corporate evaluation plan and aimed at generating information to improve UNICEF’s performance in delivering its accountabilities to children. The plan is also aimed at ensuring that UNICEF’s results on children in urban settings are visible and/or traceable in the respective country programmes.

**Objectives:** The main objectives of this evaluation are multi-fold;

1. To assess the relevance of UNICEF’s approach(es) working in cities to deliver results for children;
2. To better understand the results achieved so far by UNICEF, for children in cities;
3. To identify good practices and lessons learnt from various sustainable approach(es) of UNICEF’s work in cities to inform future directions.

**Scope of the evaluation:**

**The temporal scope:** The Evaluation should cover the period of UNICEF’s current Strategic Plan (2018-2021) as well as from the current Strategic Plan Baseline for Urban work (From 2016), in responding to the main objectives of the Evaluation.

**Geographical scope:** All regions will be considered to identify potential cases of Unicef working in Cities, to identify the suitable case that fit the proposed evaluation methodology, and to best provide the answer to the evaluation questions and meet the evaluation objectives.

**Thematic scope:** thematic scope is described above at Table 1 and would need to be further refine during the inception phase. It is anticipated that the sampling method will likely be purposeful and criteria for case selection will be developed during inception phase in consultation with the Evaluation Office, with inputs from technical reference group. However, we anticipate having countries case studies which may include Unicef work in cities in emergency settings, CFCI and Urban development programming.

To this end, careful consideration should be given to achieve the evaluation objectives and consider a wide range of factors linked with the five priorities of the UNICEF strategic note in development and emergency settings. It should also consider factors related to the UNICEF context and modus operandi, such as UNICEF capacity, Partnerships, Objectives of the urban strategy/program but not limited.

**Key questions:** These are elaborated upon in table 2 below; to be further refined during the inception phase.

**Table 2: Proposed evaluation questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Objectives</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To assess the relevance of key Urban approach currently used by UNICEF to deliver results for Children</td>
<td>1. What type of approach(es) working in cities do country offices engage in to achieve results (including results on child rights, inequity) and what is their modus operandi, including budget and technical support needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent are they consistent with the priorities identified in UNICEF’s Urban Strategic Note?</td>
<td>2. Are the approach(es) working in cities addressing the identified needs and are evidence based?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent are the approaches working in cities based on sound understanding of the local context, including the governance context, and are equity and gender sensitive?</td>
<td>5. What key results were achieved to date including results on child rights and the reduction of urban disparities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were there any intended and unintended results?</td>
<td>7. How effective were the different approaches working in cities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what extent were resources and capacity (in Country Offices and partners) adequate to effectively respond to cities programming needs?</td>
<td>9. To what extent has UNICEF successfully engaged with relevant stakeholders in its approaches in working in cities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what extent were affected cities population engaged in the identified UNICEF approaches?</td>
<td>11. What are the key considerations for enhancing the effectiveness of approaches and modus operandi?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For accountability purposes- to better understand the results achieved so far, for children in urban settings</td>
<td>3. For learning: To document good practices and lessons learnt for the potential scale up of the various sustainable urban models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What are the main lessons learned?</td>
<td>13. Are there any innovative and locally driven solutions that can be learned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To what extent can these approaches be replicated in other contexts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intended users:** There are several users for the evaluation, and they are described as follow.

The primary users are the Country Offices (COs) who are considering urban approaches to address the issues identified during the Situation analysis and/or implementing Country program with Urban approaches, especially the COs which will be visited during this evaluation during the data collection phase.

The secondary users, are the HQ divisions, and Regional Offices. Many divisions are involved with urban approaches, such a Division of Data, Research and Policy (DRP), Private Fundraising and Partnerships (PFP), Division of Program (DP) and UNICEF’s Office of Emergency Programmes. The other important users are the UNICEF Executive Board, for which the evaluation shall inform the Unicef urban approaches performance and National Committees, who are associated with urban approach (CFCI).

**V Proposed Approach**

*(To be further refined during the inception phase under the guidance and supervision of the Senior Evaluation Specialist, who will manage the evaluation with the Evaluation team leader that will be hired)*

The proposed methodology shall be suitable to address the Evaluation questions and should seek to include a mixed method approach based on a review of existing evaluations, programme documents, interviews with key stakeholders, and field visits including community engagement in the evaluation, from which the evaluation team will be expected to reconstruct the programme theory of change of selected Urban approaches and render explicit the *modus operandi*. This information should then be captured in an evaluation matrix, which also identify the indicators, data sources and analytical methods to be used to address the evaluation questions.

Consideration of the methodological approaches to be utilized in this evaluation include; a *case study design*, *most significant change* or other approach as the team may see fit. The team is encouraged to propose an approach within these lines or suggest another one that they consider better or more suitable and provide justifications for it.

Several sources of data should be included in the proposal, such as a comprehensive review of programme documents and key informant interviews with key stakeholders and partners. Finally, the evaluation should
consider an on-line survey of key stakeholders, and/or beneficiaries in countries with and without UNICEF urban programming.

The evaluation will be conducted under several phases.

**Phase 1 - Inception:** The inception phase will feature several activities, as described below. However, Evaluation consultants are free to augment these approaches, or to propose approaches that will improve the quality of the evaluation:

The inception phase will entail the conceptualisation of the approach and methodology, along with proposing a workplan and timeline. This shall include -but not limited-a review of existing literature and documents, key informant interviews. Among the key components of the Inception report should include a detailed methodological plan, data analysis plan (which data is analysed, by whom and how) and quality assurance mechanisms. The evaluation questions, may also be further refined during the inception, in agreement with Evaluation Office, during the inception phase.

**Phase 2 - data collection:** Essentially, methods of data collection used should include country cases studies covering a select number of countries from which field country case studies will be conducted. Other sources of evidences should include a comprehensive review of programme documents and interviews with key stakeholders at the UNICEF and among regional and country partners, including local government, as well as with comparable international organizations. In the field case study countries, data collection should encompass a more in-depth review of country-specific documents, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, engagement with the targeted population, and site visits. Finally, the evaluation should consider an on-line survey of key stakeholders in countries with and without active UNICEF urban programming.

**Phase 3 - data analytical phase:** Before entering the last phase -reporting phase- it’s important that team consolidate all the data they have collected during the previous phase and start analysing them and implementing the data analytical plan in search of findings, and to reach conclusions in line with each line of enquiry (EQ). This phase is an important one, which also include the operationalisation of the quality assurance method highlighted in the inception report, how triangulation will be operationalised, and related issues. Usually the outputs of this phase are of analytical natures, such as graphic, chart, statistics outputs (descriptive or inferential), etc.

**Phase 4 - Reporting phase:** The reporting phase comprising of several ongoing reports. First, as it will be agreed with Evaluation office, regular ongoing reports (weekly or bi-weekly as agreed with the senior evaluation specialist) is expected between and consultants. The content of the report will be light and meant to inform on the ongoing progress of the evaluation implementation phases, identify challenges and bottlenecks, and provide adequate support to the consultants and make appropriate decision. Progress towards key milestones of the evaluation plan, emerging challenges, and need for support from the SES.

**Phase 5 - Recommendations and findings:** A workshop might be considered to discuss the findings and recommendations with the client/stakeholders for clearance and agreeing on proper management response.

**Evaluation guidance and Standards:** The evaluation methodology should be guided by the Norms and Standards of the United Nation Evaluation Group (UNEG). http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4, GEROS and the UNEG ethical guidance to evaluation as guiding principle to ensure quality of evaluation process (http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ETHICAL+GUIDELINES). Furthermore, the evaluation should incorporate the human rights-based and gender perspective and be based on Results Based Management principles and logical framework analysis. The main deliverables will be reviewed by the EO for Quality Assurance while ensuring compliance with all Evaluation standards including GEROS.

Towards the end of the evaluation, during which a draft final report is delivered, aligned with UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group) standards and GEROS, for comments and approval. This report is considered as
internal to the team. If deemed not ready to be shared with the Reference Group, the draft report will be sent back to the team with constructive comments that are expected to be addressed. This is considered the internal draft report. Then once EO agrees that it is ready for the Reference group consultations, it will then be shared for comments. The team will then address the comments and send a revised version to the Evaluation Office for its review which will then consist of a payable deliverable; it may (or may not be shared again) with reference group.

VI Risk management and ethical issues

Availability of information: While there is systematic information on global initiatives and UNICEF priorities and programs focused on UNICEF work on children in urban settings from a global perspective, from a Country Office the most critical risk is that programming elements may still be incomplete and not available in the Annual Reports (COARs), or that implementation of activities associated with SP 2018-2021 may not have generated enough information to undertake a meaningful assessment and/or critique at the country level. An effort should be made by UNICEF (Evaluation Office and Reference group) to ensure that the Evaluation team gets as complete a picture as possible about the implementation status of activities that contribute to the UNICEF work on children in urban settings. This will enable the careful selection of assessment sites, such that maximum learning can be derived.

Ethics: The Evaluation team should seek information from different sources than children and use proxy as much as possible. Also, ethical clearance will be sought as deemed necessary.

VII Qualifications, Roles of the Evaluation team, management and governance arrangements

The Evaluation Office is seeking two international consultants - 1) a Senior Evaluation Expert and 2) an Urban Policy expert to undertake this evaluation. The Team Leader, who will be the Senior Evaluation Expert will be tasked to guide and manage the Evaluation exercise, and thus should have expertise in leading evaluations. Furthermore, all parties should have extensive experience in Urban Programming, and/or Planning and Monitoring and Evaluating international development programmes. The profiles of the consultants are summarized below;

1) Senior Evaluation Expert
   - An advanced university degree (Master’s or higher) in Public Policy, Social sciences, economics or other related fields. Additional qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the university degree;
   - A minimum of ten (10) years of relevant professional experience in leading and managing evaluation teams and practical experience conducting evaluations;
   - Knowledge of Urban issues, obtained through research, programming, and/or academic endeavors an asset;
   - Skills and experience in developing results frameworks, tools or guides for monitoring and evaluation;
   - Familiarity with results-based management orientation and practices and preparing products in the UN style; familiarity with UNICEF’s programming and management systems will be an added advantage;
   - Familiarity with UNEG evaluation standards, including the UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations, is an asset;
   - Excellent analytical and writing skills in English is required. Knowledge of another official UN language (Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian or Spanish) is an asset.

2) Urban Specialist
   - An advanced university degree (Master’s or higher) in Public Policy, Social sciences, economics or other related fields. Additional qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the university degree;
• A minimum of eight (8) years of relevant professional Urban programming experience (with UNICEF highly desirable)

• Up-to-date knowledge, skills, comprehensive practice and/or experience in the field of Urban issues, obtained through research, programming, and/or academic endeavors

• Evaluative expertise will be an added advantage

• Familiarity with results-based management orientation and practices and preparing products in the UN style; familiarity with UNICEF’s programming and management systems will be an added advantage

• Excellent analytical and writing skills in English is required. Knowledge of another official UN language (Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian or Spanish) is an asset.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Any conflict of interest in this evaluation should be declared earlier on in the process—during the bidding and contracting stage. A declaration form shall also be signed by the parties.

Role of Evaluation Office

The Evaluation will be managed from the UNICEF’s Evaluation Office, by the Senior Evaluation Specialist (SES) and assisted by an Assistant Evaluation Manager. The Senior Evaluation Specialist will supervise and guide the conceptual aspects of the Evaluation in close collaboration with the team leader (approach and methodology) which will be ultimately approved by the SES as he/she will contribute to the development of the GEROS compliant Final Evaluation and the generation and validation of the recommendations. He/she will also have responsibility to:

• Co-ordinate, direct and supervise all activities of the Team leader and Evaluation and its execution;

• Be the liaison between the Team leader, Evaluation team and with the reference group and provide periodical updates on the execution of the Evaluation, as well as internal review processes;

• Prepare publishing-ready versions of the reports for issuing by the Director, Evaluation Office;

• Provide oversight and guidance to the evaluation team on UNICEF requirements and standards for evaluative work; and,

• Provide quality assurance and approve all deliverables.

Role and responsibilities of the consultants

Evaluation Team Leader:

• Responsible for the overall delivery of the evaluation according to the ToRs and approved Inception Report and he is primarily accountable for the quality of the deliverables.

• She/He will supervise and provide direction to the team member(s) as required and by the approved inception report.

• S/he will have primary responsibility for producing/compiling/editing/writing of the evaluation reports and deliverables indicated in this ToRs.

• Develop the Inception report, and relevant tools, method and approaches for the overall evaluation. This include sub-tasking to the SES as necessary and approved Inception report.

• Write and present the draft final report, as per the UNEG/GEROS standards.

Urban Policy Specialist:

• Urban Policy Specialist under the direction of the Team Leader is jointly accountable for the quality and deliverables.

• Provide support and accomplish necessary tasks as approved in the inception report and agreed by the Team leader, such as the development of relevant tools, method and approaches for the overall evaluation;
Role of Reference group

To be appointed by the Director, Evaluation Office, the reference group will provide expert advice during the assessment. The reference group will have the responsibilities:

- Provide inputs in the inception phase to influence the approach of the Evaluation, and, where necessary, provide information, relevant documentations and institutional knowledge as key informants;
- Review selected evaluation products (inception report, and final/penultimate report) and providing written comments to the review team through the evaluation manager; and,
- Contribute to the post-evaluation management response, action plan and dissemination strategy.

VIII Timeframe and key deliverables

The Evaluation should be completed within 4-5 months (May 2019 – September 2019) with a final report formatted for submission to the board. Expected deliverables are as follows:

a. An *inception report* (first payable deliverable) which outlines the Evaluation methodology and approaches, proposed analytical framework, Key desk review, data analysis plan, and document to be analyzed, and instruments for interviews with stakeholders, and an outline of the final report, including proposed annexes;

b. The *first draft evaluation report* (not a payable deliverable) that includes complete set of findings, and conclusions on the overall assessments of UNICEF-supported interventions in Urban Settings, draft recommendations and all annexes. This report will also include; draft country case study reports of UNICEF’s work in urban settings. This version will be reviewed mainly by EO.

c. The *second draft evaluation report* (second payable deliverable) of the Evaluation report, will include EO early comments (step b. above, and considered the internal draft) and the executive summary. This version will have been shared and reviewed by the reference group and their comments fully addressed at satisfaction of EO before payment.

d. The final draft of the Evaluation report, duly reviewed for quality, and conforming to the UNICEF publishing/GEROS standards;

e. Workshop for clearing the findings and recommendations (third payable deliverable);

f. *Final evaluation report* (last payable deliverable) which will take on the comments from the workshop to finalize and complete the assignment with a final evaluation report.

g. *PowerPoint presentations*: Initially prepared and used by the evaluation team in their presentation to the reference group, a standalone PowerPoint will be submitted to the Evaluation Office as part of the evaluation deliverables (Inception Report and Recommendations Workshop).

h. *Datasets (qualitative and quantitative)* will be submitted to the Evaluation Office as part of the evaluation deliverables, in soft and hard copies.

Table 4: Proposed timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Milestone / Process(^6)</th>
<th>Number of Days TL</th>
<th>Number of Days Urban specialist</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RG formed, Draft ToRs shared with RG for feedback and consultation</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A</td>
<td>19-03-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ToRs finalized based on consultation with RG</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A</td>
<td>03-04-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Indicative and to be revised as soon as a team is recruited.

\(^7\) UNICEF has instituted the Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS), a system where final evaluation reports are quality-assessed by an external independent company against UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports. The Evaluation team is expected reflect on and conform to these standards.

\(^8\) Please note that if a step can have concluded sooner or later, then it will affect the entire time frame.
As reflected in the Table 4 above, the evaluation has a timeline of approximately 20 weeks (4-5 months) from the beginning of the inception period to the submission of the final report.

### VIII Schedule of Payment

Payments will be made as per the schedule below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Schedule of payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverables</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Inception Report (step 8): payable after the EO &amp; RG have reviewed report and their comments have been successfully addressed by the team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Include travel days. This is indicative and will be adjusted once the team is on board.
First Draft Final Evaluation Report (with related case study reports) (Step 12): payable after the EO and TRG has reviewed draft report and comments have been successfully addressed by the team 30%

Recommendations workshop (Step 14) 15%

Final Evaluation Report (step 15): Payable after the EO, RG and stakeholders from workshop has reviewed draft report and comments are successfully addressed by the team 30%

Failure to submit the deliverables in accordance with the TORs and the required Evaluation standards, will result in payments being withheld.

How to apply:

Interested candidates should submit a letter of interest, and resume(s), as well as examples of relevant evaluation reports and or study reports, clarifying their role and contribution to the evaluation as they relate to Urban programming, by **May 19th 2019**.

This should be accompanied by a financial proposal, indicating the daily fees and a technical proposal (of up to 15 pages) demonstrating a candidate’s knowledge of Evaluation methods and approaches, data collection and tools and Urban approaches, especially with UNICEF context, and how they propose to deliver on the above TORs with quality evaluation services. Note that, travel, accommodation and incidental expenses will be covered directly by the UNICEF Evaluation Office.

Remarks

Only shortlisted candidates will be contacted and advance to the next stage of the selection process. Reference persons may be contacted as well.